



---

John Dewey and the Progressive-Education Movement, 1915-1952

Author(s): Lawrence A. Cremin

Source: *The School Review*, Vol. 67, No. 2, Dewey Centennial Issue (Summer, 1959), pp. 160-173

Published by: [The University of Chicago Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1083643>

Accessed: 09/08/2011 14:29

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at  
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



*The University of Chicago Press* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The School Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

## *John Dewey and the Progressive-Education Movement, 1915-1952*

John Dewey had a story—it must have been a favorite of his—about “a man who was somewhat sensitive to the movements of things about him. He had a certain appreciation of what things were passing away and dying and of what things were being born and growing. And on the strength of that response he foretold some of the things that were going to happen in the future. When he was seventy years old the people gave him a birthday party and they gave him credit for bringing to pass the things he had foreseen might come to pass” (1). With characteristic modesty, Dewey told the story autobiographically, using it to describe his own place in the history of American life and thought. And granted the genuinely seminal character of his contribution, there was a measure of truth to his disclaimer.

Consider, for example, Dewey’s relation to the early progressive-education movement; it provides an excellent case in point. We know that the movement arose during the 1890’s as a many-sided protest against pedagogical narrowness and inequity. It was essentially pluralistic, often self-contradictory, and always related to broader currents of social and political progressivism. In the universities it appeared as part of a spirited revolt against formalism in philosophy, psychology, and the social sciences. In the cities it emerged as one facet of a larger program of social alleviation and municipal reform. Among farmers, it became the crux of a moderate, liberal alternative to radical agrarianism.

It was at the same time the “social education” demanded by urban

settlement workers, the “schooling for country life” demanded by rural publicists, the vocational training demanded by businessmen’s associations and labor unions alike, and the new techniques of instruction demanded by *avant garde* pedagogues. Like progressivism writ large, it compounded a fascinating congeries of seemingly disparate elements: the romanticism of G. Stanley Hall and the realism of Jacob Riis, the scientism of Joseph Mayer Rice and the reformism of Jane Addams. Its keynote was diversity, of protest, of protestor, of proposal, and of proponent; it was a diversity destined to leave its ineradicable mark on a half-century of educational reform (2).

There were, needless to say, numerous attempts to portray this remarkable movement in its early decades; but nowhere is its extraordinary diversity more intelligently documented than in Dewey’s volume *Schools of To-Morrow*, published in 1915 in collaboration with his daughter Evelyn (3). Over the years, Dewey’s continuing interest in pedagogical theory, his widely publicized work at the Laboratory School he and Mrs. Dewey had founded in 1896, his reputation as a tough-minded analyst of pedagogical schemes, and his unfailing support of progressive causes had combined to make him increasingly an acknowledged spokesman of the progressive-education movement. *Schools of To-Morrow* did much to secure this image of him in the public mind. Within ten years the book had gone through fourteen printings, unusual for any book, unheard-of for a book about education.

Written neither as a textbook nor as a dogmatic exposition of “the new,” the volume is designed “to show what actually happens when schools start out to put into practice, each in its own way, some of the theories that have been pointed to as the soundest and best ever since Plato” (3: Preface). More than anything, the Dewey of *Schools of To-Morrow* is the man “sensitive to the movement of things about him.” The reader is treated to a fascinating collection of glimpses—into Marietta Johnson’s Organic School at Fairhope, Alabama, Junius Meriam’s experimental school at the University of Missouri, the Francis Parker School in Chicago, Caroline Pratt’s Play

School in New York, the Kindergarten at Teachers College, Columbia University, and certain public schools of Gary, Chicago, and Indianapolis. In each instance, the guiding educational theory is given and the techniques by which the theory is put into practice are described. The approach is essentially journalistic; Dewey's enterprise is to elucidate rather than to praise or criticize.

Yet there is a very special kind of reporting here, one that bears closer examination. Richard Hofstadter has observed that the Progressive mind was typically a journalistic mind, and that its characteristic contribution was that of a socially responsible reporter-reformer (4). Certainly this was Dewey's central contribution in *Schools of To-Morrow*. For in addition to the who, the what, the when, and the where, Dewey gives us a succession of social whys that quickly transform a seemingly unrelated agglomeration of pedagogical experiments into the several facets of a genuine social movement.

Merely as a record of what progressive education actually was and what it meant to Dewey *circa* 1915, the book is invaluable. The text abounds in vivid descriptions of the physical education, the nature studies, the manual work, the industrial training, and the innumerable "socialized activities" in the schools of tomorrow. There is exciting talk of more freedom for children, of greater attention to individual growth and development, of a new unity between education and life, of a more meaningful school curriculum, of a vast democratizing of culture and learning. Nowhere is the faith and optimism of the progressive-education movement more dramatically conveyed.

Moreover, as the analysis proceeds, Dewey's powers as a "socially responsible reporter-reformer" are soon apparent. He points enthusiastically to the concern with initiative, originality, and resourcefulness in the new pedagogy, deeming these qualities central to the life of a free society. He commends the breadth of the new school programs, their attention to health, citizenship, and vocation, arguing that such breadth is not only a necessary adaptation to industrialism

but an effort to realize for the first time in history the democratic commitment to equal educational opportunity. He sees the new emphasis on “learning by doing” as a device par excellence to narrow the gap between school and life; and closeness to life is required “if the pupil is to understand the facts which the teacher wishes him to learn; if his knowledge is to be real, not verbal; if his education is to furnish standards of judgment and comparison” (3: 294). Even more important, perhaps, a school close to life sends into society men and women “intelligent in the pursuit of the activities in which they engage” (3: 249). People educated in this way are inevitably agents of constructive social change, and the schools which educate them are thereby intimately bound to the larger cause of reform (3: 226–27). Indeed, it is this very tie that makes progressive education progressive!

Actually, the dialectic between Dewey the observer and Dewey the reformer is probably the most intriguing thing about the volume (5). On the one hand, we know that many of the pedagogical experiments he describes grew up quite independently of his own theorizing (6). On the other hand, we recognize much in *Schools of To-Morrow* that exemplifies the very things he himself was urging in pamphlets going back at least twenty years (7). The only way to reconcile the two Deweys, it seems, is to return to his own disclaimer, that he really was “the man sensitive to the movement of things about him” and to the thesis that his most seminal contribution was to develop a body of pedagogical theory which could encompass the terrific diversity of the progressive-education movement. It is no coincidence that *Democracy and Education* came a year later and wove the diverse strands of a quarter-century of educational protest and innovation into an integral theory (8). The later work has since overshadowed *Schools of To-Morrow*, but the two ought not to be read apart. One is as much the classic of the early progressive-education movement as the other. Their genius was to express a pedagogical age. For their very existence, the movement was infused with larger meaning and hence could never be the same again.

World War I marks a great divide in the history of progressive education. Merely the founding of the Progressive Education Association in 1919 would have changed the movement significantly, since what had formerly been a rather loosely defined revolt against academic formalism now gained a vigorous organizational voice (9). But there were deeper changes, in the image of progressivism itself, that were bound to influence the course and meaning of educational reform.

Malcolm Cowley, in his delightful reminiscence of the twenties, *Exile's Return*, describes these changes well. He notes insightfully that intellectual protest in prewar years had mingled two quite different sorts of revolt: bohemianism and radicalism. The one was essentially an individual revolt against puritan restraint; the other, primarily a social revolt against the evils of capitalism. World War I, he argues, brought a parting of the ways. People were suddenly forced to decide what kinds of rebels they were. If they were merely rebels against puritanism, they could exist safely in Mr. Wilson's world; if they were radicals, they had no place in it (10).

Cowley's analysis provides a key to one of the important intellectual shifts of the twenties. With the end of the War, radicalism seemed no longer in fashion among the *avant garde*, particularly the artists and literati who flocked to the Greenwich Villages of New York, Chicago, and San Francisco. It did not die; it was merely eclipsed by a polyglot system of ideas which combined the doctrines of self-expression, liberty, and psychological adjustment into a confident, iconoclastic individualism that fought the constraints of Babbitry and the discipline of social reform as well. And just as prewar progressivism had given rise to a new educational outlook, one which cast the school as a lever of social change, so this postwar protest developed its own characteristic pedagogical argument: the notion that each individual has uniquely creative potentialities, and that a school in which children are encouraged freely to develop these potentialities is the best guarantee of a larger society truly devoted to human worth and excellence.

Now those who had read *Schools of To-Morrow* must certainly have recognized this essentially Rousseauian stance; it had been at the heart of several of the schools Dewey had described. Yet readers who had troubled to follow Dewey's argument to the end, and who had accepted his analysis incorporating Rousseau's insights into a larger social reformism, must have noted a curious difference of emphasis here (11). For just as radicalism seemed eclipsed in the broader protests of the twenties, so it seemed to disappear from the progressive pedagogy of the decade (12). For all intents and purposes, the *avant garde* pedagogues expanded one part of what progressive education had formerly meant into its total meaning.

Nowhere is this transformation more clearly documented than in the characteristic exegesis of progressive education during the twenties, *The Child-Centered School* (13). Written by Harold Rugg and Ann Shumaker in 1928, the volume attempts for the movement in its time what *Schools of To-Morrow* had done a decade earlier. Its pages teem with pedagogical experiments illustrating the new articles of pedagogical faith: freedom, child interest, pupil initiative, creative self-expression, and personality development. And just as Dewey had seen a central connection with democracy as the crux of the earlier movement, so Rugg and Shumaker saw the relationship with the creative revolution of the twenties as the essential meaning of this one. To grasp the significance of the child-centered schools, they urged, one had to comprehend the historic battle of the artist against the standardization, the superficiality, and the commercialism of industrial civilization. The key to the creative revolution of the twenties was the triumph of self-expression, in art and in education as well. Hence, in creative self-expression they found the quintessential meaning of the progressive-education movement.

Dewey, of course, was not unaware of the continuing ferment in pedagogical circles. His interest in education persisted, but as the decade progressed he became less and less the sensitive observer and interpreter of the progressive-education movement and increasingly its critic. As early as 1926, for example, he attacked the studied

lack of adult guidance in the *avant garde* schools with a sharpness uncommon in his writing. "Such a method," he observed, "is really stupid. For it attempts the impossible, which is always stupid; and it misconceives the conditions of independent thinking" (14: 37). Freedom, he counselled, is not something given at birth; nor is it bred of planlessness. It is something to be achieved, to be systematically wrought out in co-operation with experienced teachers, knowledgeable in their own traditions. Baby, Dewey insisted, does not know best! (14)

Two years later, the same year *The Child-Centered School* appeared, Dewey used the occasion of a major address before the Progressive Education Association to reiterate his point. "Progressive schools," he noted, "set store by individuality, and sometimes it seems to be thought that orderly organization of subject-matter is hostile to the needs of students in their individual character. But individuality is something developing and to be continuously attained, not something given all at once and ready-made" (15: 201). Far from being hostile to the principle of individuality, he continued, some systematic organization of activities and subject matter is the only means for actually achieving individuality; and teachers, by virtue of their richer and fuller experience, have not only the right but the high obligation to assist students in the enterprise (15).

His strictures were not heeded, and in 1930 he leveled them even more vigorously in the concluding essay of a *New Republic* series evaluating a decade of progressive education (16). The formalism and isolation of the conventional schoolroom had literally cried out for reform, he recalled. But the point of the progressive revolt had been not to rid the school of subject matter, but rather to build a new subject matter, as well organized as the old but having a more intimate relation to the experience of students. "The relative failure to accomplish this result indicates the one-sidedness of the idea of the 'child-centered' school" (16: 205).

Then Dewey went on to a more pervasive criticism. Progressive schools, he conceded, had been most successful in furthering creativ-



ity in the arts. But this accomplishment, however much it contributed to private sensibilities, had hardly met either the social or the aesthetic needs of a democratic-industrial society. A truly progressive education, he concluded, "requires a searching study of society and its moving forces. That the traditional schools have almost wholly evaded consideration of the social potentialities of education is no reason why progressive schools should continue the evasion, even though it be sugared over with aesthetic refinements. The time ought to come when no one will be judged to be an educated man or woman who does not have insight into the basic forces of industrial and urban civilization. Only schools which take the lead in bringing about this kind of education can claim to be progressive in any socially significant sense" (16: 206).

Dewey's comments seemed particularly *à propos* in the summer of 1930. Already the depression which was to envelop the nation and become the central fact of the thirties was very much in evidence. Breadlines were common in the industrial cities, and women could be seen raking through community refuse heaps as soon as garbage trucks departed. Suddenly radicalism was no longer *passé*; it was bohemianism that appeared a little out of date (17). Socially conscious notions of progressive education, disparaged by the *avant garde* of the twenties as "social efficiency," were now very much to the point (18).

It should be no surprise that Dewey's formulation of the meaning of progressivism in education came once again to the fore. Early in 1932 he accepted membership on a yearbook commission of the National Society of College Teachers of Education dedicated to producing a statement of philosophy of education appropriate to the times. The volume which emerged, *The Educational Frontier*, is, like *The Child-Centered School*, the characteristic progressivist statement of its decade. And while its formulations are essentially collaborative, Dewey's own views are clearly discernible in two chapters he wrote jointly with his student, John L. Childs (19).

The Dewey of these chapters is now the vigorous proponent. His

plea is for an educational program conceived in the broadest terms, one which has "definite reference to the needs and issues which mark and divide our domestic, economic, and political life in the generation of which we are a part" (19: 36). As with his educational outlook from the beginning, his call is for a school close to life, one that will send into society people able to understand it, to live intelligently as part of it, and to change it to suit their visions of the better life. Once again, he sees changes through education as "correlative and interactive" with changes through politics. "No social modification, slight or revolutionary, can endure except as it enters into the action of a people through their desires and purposes. This introduction and perpetuation are effected by education" (19: 318).

Dewey held essentially to this position throughout the stormy thirties. To George Counts's provocative question "Dare the school build a new social order?" Dewey replied that in an industrial society with its multiplicity of political and educative agencies, the school could never be the main determinant of political, intellectual, or moral change (20). "Nevertheless," he continued, "while the school is not a sufficient condition, it is a necessary condition of *forming the understanding and the dispositions* that are required to maintain a genuinely changed social order" (21). It would be revolution enough, Dewey once told an NEA audience, were educators to begin to recognize the fact of social change and to act upon that recognition in the schools (22).

Dewey steadfastly opposed indoctrination in the form of the inculcation of fixed social beliefs. But he did contend that for schools to be progressive, teachers would have to select the newer scientific, technological, and cultural forces producing changes in the old order, estimate their outcomes if given free play, and see what could be done to make the schools their ally (23). To some, of course, this was as crass a form of indoctrination as any; and Dewey was criticized on the one hand by those who insisted that his notions would cast the school into an indefensible presentism at the expense of traditional values and verities, and on the other by those in the progressive

camp who maintained that any social guidance by adults was really an unwarranted form of imposition.

Dewey replied to both groups in what was destined to be his most important pedagogical work of the thirties, *Experience and Education*. The volume is really a restatement of aspects of his educational outlook in the context of the criticisms, distortions, and misunderstandings which had grown up over two decades. There is little fundamentally new, except perhaps the tone. Progressive educators, he suggests, should begin to think "in terms of Education itself rather than in terms of some 'ism about education, even such an 'ism as 'progressivism.' For in spite of itself any movement that thinks and acts in terms of an 'ism becomes so involved in reaction against other 'isms that it is unwittingly controlled by them. For it then forms its principles by reaction against them instead of by a comprehensive constructive survey of actual needs, problems, and possibilities" (24). By 1938, Dewey the sensitive observer could already note, probably with a measure of sadness, that the movement was devoting too much of its energy to internecine ideological conflict and too little, perhaps, to the advancement of its own cause.

Frederic Lilge, in a perceptive essay he recently published in a volume honoring Robert Ulich, contends that Dewey's pedagogical progressivism embodies a fundamental inconsistency which Dewey never really resolves (25). A theory which seems to harmonize the school with the larger social environment, Lilge argues, and which casts the school as a lever of reform, inevitably faces a twofold difficulty: first in determining which social goals to serve in the school; and second, in deciding whether or not to embark on an ever broader program of political reform outside the school. Thus, "Dewey was confronted by two equally repellent alternatives: pursuing his basic aim of adjusting the schools to the social environment, he could integrate them with institutions and practices whose underlying values he rejected; or he could attempt to withdraw them from being thus corrupted, but at the cost of sacrificing that closeness to

actual life which it was one of the main aims of his educational philosophy to establish" (25: 29). Lilge contends that Dewey accepted neither, and that the thirties saw him and a number of influential followers increasingly thrust into a clearly political program of reform, both via the schools and outside them. Their manifesto was Counts's pamphlet, *Dare the School Build a New Social Order*; their statement of educational principles was *The Educational Frontier*; their intellectual organ was the *Social Frontier*, a journal which appeared regularly in the decade following 1934.

Now Lilge himself grants that his analysis is far more relevant to some of Dewey's disciples than to Dewey himself. Even so, some clarification is needed. For to pose the dilemma in the first place is to misread the relationship between progressive education and progressivism writ large, particularly as Dewey perceived it. Dewey had no illusions about the school changing society on its own; that educational and political reform would have to go hand in hand was the progressive view from the beginning (26). Nor did the notion of adjusting the school to society imply that the school would have to accommodate itself to all institutions and practices. Dewey wanted schools to use the stuff of reality to educate men and women intelligent about reality. His notion of adjustment was an adjustment of conditions, not *to* them, a remaking of existing conditions, not a mere remaking of self and individual to fit into them (27). And as for the corrupting influence of life itself, Dewey was no visionary; the problem for him was not to build *the perfect society* but *a better society*. To this he thought a school that educated for intelligence about reality could make a unique contribution.

Dewey restated these faiths in the introductory essay he wrote for Elsie Clapp's 1952 volume, *The Use of Resources in Education*; it is probably his last major statement on education (28). Once again, he returns to the role of sensitive observer. "In the course of more than half a century of participation in the theory and practice of education," he writes, "I have witnessed many successes and many failures in what is popularly known as 'progressive education,'

but is also known as 'the new education,' 'modern education,' and so on." He sees the triumph of the movement in the changed life-conditions of the American classroom, in a greater awareness of the needs of the growing human being, in the warmer personal relations between teachers and students. But as with all reform victories, he sees attendant dangers. No education is progressive, he warns, unless it is making progress. And he observes somewhat poignantly that in schools and colleges across the country, progressive education has been converted into a set of fixed rules and procedures "to be applied to educational problems externally, the way mustard plasters, for example, are applied." If this ossification continues, he fears progressive education will end up guilty of the very formalism it sought to correct, a formalism "fit for the foundations of a totalitarian society and, for the same reason, fit to subvert, pervert and destroy the foundations of a democratic society."

"For the creation of democratic society," he concludes, "we need an educational system where the process of moral-intellectual development is in practice as well as in theory a cooperative transaction of inquiry engaged in by free, independent human beings who treat ideas and the heritage of the past as means and methods for the further enrichments of life, quantitatively and qualitatively, who use the good attained for the discovery and establishment of something better." Dewey's sentence is involved, complex, and overly long; but it embodies the essence of the movement as he saw it. Those who would understand progressive education would do well to ponder it, as would those who set out to build today's schools of tomorrow.

#### NOTES

1. *John Dewey: The Man and His Philosophy* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1930), p. 174.
2. See my essay, "The Progressive Movement in American Education: A Reappraisal," *Harvard Educational Review*, XXVII (Fall, 1957), 251-70.
3. John Dewey and Evelyn Dewey, *Schools of To-Morrow* (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1915).

4. Richard Hofstadter, *The Age of Reform* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1955), p. 185.

5. Actually, Evelyn Dewey visited the several schools and wrote the descriptive chapters of the volume; but no pun is intended by the phrase "Dewey the observer." The larger design of the book—both descriptive and analytical—is obviously the elder Dewey's.

6. One need only check some of the independent accounts, for example, Marietta Johnson, "Thirty Years with an Idea" (Unpublished manuscript in the library of Teachers College, Columbia University, 1939), or Caroline Pratt, *I Learn from Children* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1948).

7. The ideas of *My Pedagogic Creed* (New York: E. L. Kellogg & Co., 1897), *The School and Society* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1899), *The Child and the Curriculum* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1902), and "The School as Social Center" (published in the National Education Association *Proceedings* for 1902) are particularly apparent. See Melvin C. Baker, *Foundations of John Dewey's Educational Theory* (New York: King's Crown Press, 1955) for an analysis of Dewey's pedagogical ideas prior to 1904.

8. John Dewey, *Democracy and Education* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1916).

9. The organization was founded by a young reformist educator named Stanwood Cobb, who had come under the influence of Marietta Johnson. Dewey refused a number of early invitations to associate himself with the group, but later served as its honorary president. The best account of the Association's first years is given in Robert Holmes Beck, "American Progressive Education, 1875-1930" (Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Yale University, 1942).

10. Malcolm Cowley, *Exile's Return* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1934), chap. ii. Henry F. May contends that the shift toward what Cowley calls bohemianism actually began well before the War. See "The Rebellion of the Intellectuals, 1912-1917," *American Quarterly*, VIII (Summer, 1956), 114-26.

11. The incorporation is most clearly evident in chapter xii of *Schools of To-Morrow*. See also Dewey's comments on Rousseau in chapters vii and ix of *Democracy and Education*.

12. Radicalism even tended to disappear from the pedagogical formulations of many political radicals. See, for example, Agnes de Lima, *Our Enemy the Child* (New York: New Republic, 1925), chap. xii.

13. Harold Rugg and Ann Shumaker, *The Child-Centered School* (Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York: World Book Co., 1928).

14. His essay, originally published in the *Journal of the Barnes Foundation*, is reprinted in John Dewey *et al.*, *Art and Education*, pp. 32-40.

15. John Dewey, "Progressive Education and the Science of Education," *Progressive Education*, V (July-August-September, 1928), 197-204.

16. John Dewey, "How Much Freedom in New Schools?" *New Republic*,

LXIII (July 9, 1930), 204-6. The decade to which the *New Republic* refers is, of course, 1919-29. The implication, that progressive education really began with the founding of the Progressive Education Association, is oft-repeated but erroneous.

17. Cowley's Epilogue in the 1951 reissue of *Exile's Return* is an interesting commentary on this point.

18. The common cry was that Dewey had been too much the rationalist to develop an adequate theory of creativity. See, for example, *The Child-Centered School*, pp. iv; 324-25.

19. William H. Kilpatrick (ed.), *The Educational Frontier* (New York: D. Appleton-Century, 1933). Dewey actually wrote chapters ii and ix, though as joint efforts with Childs. See also "The Crucial Role of Intelligence," *Social Frontier*, I (February, 1935), 9-10.

20. See George S. Counts, *Dare the School Build a New Social Order?* (New York: John Day Co., 1932). The tension between bohemianism and radicalism within the progressive-education movement is dramatically portrayed by Counts in a 1932 address to the Progressive Education Association, "Dare Progressive Education Be Progressive?" *Progressive Education*, IX (April, 1932), 257-63.

21. John Dewey, "Education and Social Change," *Social Frontier*, III (May, 1937), 235-38. Italics mine. See also "Can Education Share in Social Reconstruction?" *Social Frontier*, I (October, 1934), 11-12.

22. John Dewey, "Education for a Changing Social Order," National Education Association *Proceedings*, 1934, pp. 744-52.

23. John Dewey, "Education and Social Change," *op. cit.* and "Education, Democracy, and Socialized Economy," *Social Frontier*, V (December, 1938), 71-72. The latter article deals with an exchange between John L. Childs and Boyd H. Bode in the previous issue of *Social Frontier*.

24. John Dewey, *Experience and Education* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1938), pp. vi-vii.

25. Frederic Lilge, "Politics and the Philosophy of Education," in *Liberal Traditions in Education*, ed. George Z. F. Bereday (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, 1958), pp. 27-49.

26. Dewey makes the point on page 226 of *Schools of To-Morrow* and in Article V of *My Pedagogic Creed*.

27. This is a central point in view of contemporary attacks on Dewey. See *The Educational Frontier*, p. 312.

28. Elsie Ripley Clapp, *The Use of Resources in Education* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1952), pp. vii-xi.